

Brian C. Rocca, S.B. #221576  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
Sujal J. Shah, S.B. #215230  
sujal.shah@morganlewis.com  
Michelle Park Chiu, S.B. #248421  
michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com  
Minna Lo Naranjo, S.B. #259005  
minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com  
Rishi P. Satia, S.B. #301958  
rishi.satia@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000  
Facsimile: (415) 422-1001

Richard S. Taffet, *pro hac vice*  
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
Telephone: (212) 309-6000  
Facsimile: (212) 309-6001

Ian Simmons, *pro hac vice*  
isimmons@omm.com  
Benjamin G. Bradshaw, S.B. #189925  
bbradshaw@omm.com  
**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
1625 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 383-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 383-5414

*Attorneys for Defendants*

Glenn D. Pomerantz, S.B. #112503  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
Kuruville Olasa, S.B. #281509  
kuruville.olasa@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Kyle W. Mach, S.B. #282090  
kyle.mach@mto.com  
Justin P. Raphael, S.B. #292380  
justin.raaphael@mto.com  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty, S.B. #293065  
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Jonathan I. Kravis, *pro hac vice*  
jonathan.kravis@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
601 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 500E  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 220-1100

Daniel M. Petrocelli, S.B. #97802  
dpetrocelli@omm.com  
Stephen J. McIntyre, S.B. #274481  
smcintyre@omm.com  
**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
1999 Avenue of the Stars  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 553-6700  
Facsimile: (310) 246-6779

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

*Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-  
cv-05671-JD

*In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*, Case No.  
3:20-cv-05761-JD

*Utah v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:21- cv-05227-  
JD

CASE NO. 3:21-MD-02981-JD

**[PROPOSED] ORDER ON  
GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

Having considered Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Material Should be Sealed and Plaintiffs' Declaration in Support of the Administrative Motion; the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal and Declaration of Christian Cramer filed in response by Defendants Google LLC, Google Ireland Limited, Google Commerce Limited, Google Asia Pacific Pte. Limited, and Google Payment Corp. (collectively, "Google"); and any other appropriate papers or argument:

The Court finds that Google has shown good cause to seal the materials identified in the table below and contained in Plaintiffs and Non-Party Activision Blizzard, Inc.'s joint discovery letter brief (MDL ECF No. 259), including "the legitimate private or public interests that warrant sealing; [] the injury that will result if sealing is denied; and [] why a less restrictive alternative to sealing is not sufficient," pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Rule 79-5 and this Court's Standing Order For Civil Cases.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

Portion(s) to Seal	Reason(s) for Sealing	Ruling
Page 4, fourth paragraph, third sentence. Four words describing financial consideration in a confidential business contract. <sup>1</sup>	This clause purports to describe the financial consideration received by Activision Blizzard under a confidential agreement with Google. Cramer Decl. ¶¶ 8, 10. The terms of confidential business agreements are competitively sensitive. Public disclosure of Plaintiffs' purported description of the financial consideration received by Activision Blizzard could affect Google's	

<sup>1</sup> Although Activision is the designating party for this portion of the sentence, for the reasons stated in the corresponding Reasons for Sealing, the Court finds that Google has standing to seek its sealing because it concerns terms of a deal to which Google was a party.

Portion(s) to Seal	Reason(s) for Sealing	Ruling
	future business negotiations and inform decision-making by Google's competitors, and thereby damage Google's competitive position in the marketplace.	
Page 5, second paragraph, second sentence. From after "a competing app store" to end of sentence.	This clause purports to describe the nature and value of the consideration received by Activision Blizzard under a confidential agreement with Google. Cramer Decl. ¶¶ 9–10. The terms of confidential business agreements are competitively sensitive. Public disclosure of Plaintiffs' purported description of the nature and value of consideration received by Activision Blizzard could affect Google's future business negotiations and inform decision-making by Google's competitors, and thereby damage Google's competitive position in the marketplace.	

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2022

---

Hon. James Donato  
U.S. District Judge